

The Board of Supervisors of Maricopa County, Arizona convened in Informal Session at 9:00 a.m., August 22, 2005 in the Supervisors' Conference Room, 301 W. Jefferson, Phoenix, Arizona, with the following members present: Max W. Wilson, Chairman, District 4; Don Stapley, Vice Chairman, District 2, Fulton Brock, District 1; Andrew Kunasek, District 3, and Mary Rose Wilcox, District 5, (entered late). Also present: Lori Pacini, Deputy Clerk of the Board; Juanita Garza, Minutes Coordinator; David Smith, County Manager; and Paul Golab, Deputy County Attorney. Votes of the Members will be recorded as follows: (aye-no-absent-abstain).

PRESENTATION – TEEN COURT PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Presentation on the Teen Court Program in Maricopa County (ADM1200)

Judge Barbara Mundell, Superior Court Presiding Judge

Bill Graham, Director, Teen Court Program

Judge Emmet Ronan, Juvenile Presiding Judge

Judge Barbara Mundell thanked the Supervisors for the opportunity to present and discuss the importance of the Teen Court Program before the Board. Judge Mundell briefly highlighted the objective of the Teen Court Program before turning it over to Judge Emmet Ronan. Judge Mundell stated that the Teen Court program is a "diversion/prevention" program in which first-time juvenile offenders are held accountable through sentences imposed by a jury of their peers. She also noted that the program offers volunteer youths the opportunity to learn about the law and practice responsible citizenship.

~ Supervisor Wilcox entered the meeting ~

Judge Emmet Ronan spoke of the value of Teen Court. Judge Ronan reported that the program currently has a total of 26 teen courts, 6 in the court system and 20 that operate in the schools that handle about 500 cases. Approximately 35,000 cases are referred to juvenile court every year; these are issues that can be resolved at a much lower level. Judge Ronan said that the offenders appear to be more nervous when they have to face their peers and learn a more valuable lesson from this experience. Judge Ronan stated that the real value of Teen Court is the lesson in citizenship. Judge Ronan added that Teen Court teaches teens the importance of volunteer work, value, respect, and team work. Judge Ronan added that Teen Court impacts every single teen that participates in the program.

Bill Graham introduced the following judges: Judge Ted Armbruster, first Municipal Court Program, Judge Orr, was one of the first judges to serve on Teen Court where the program was first implemented, and Judge Margaret Trujillo, Community Outreach Director for Superior Court.

Judge Margaret Trujillo stepped forward to speak. Judge Trujillo said that starting the Teen Program has been one of the highlights in her life, "Teen Court impacts teens at multiple levels." Judge Trujillo said that she is fascinated to see how many parents and kids get involved in this program. She added that many youths experience low self-esteem in school and society and the experience of this program has greatly boosted their self-esteem.

Bill Graham continued by introducing the members of the Teen Court Board Staff: Barbara Broderick, Director of Adult Probation Services; Jean Gedney, Field Supervisor; Gary Egbert, Juvenile Probation Officer and East Valley Teen Coordinator; Charles Cordova, West Valley Teen Court Coordinator; Carol Parker, Supervisor of Administrative Work, and Julie Edwards, Teen Court Clerk.

Mr. Graham said, "It takes three entities, a court system, a school system and the funding agency such as the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors to run a community Teen Court program." Mr. Graham stated that the objective of Teen Court is to bring communities together to work with the youths and

address the problem of juvenile crime within the community. He said that the Arizona Teen Court is a national model. The Arizona Teen Court was chosen for a study about 5 years ago and it proved to be effective due to the fact that "half of these kids do not commit the same offense twice."

Mr. Graham briefly outlined the four national models used in Teen Court: Adult Judge Model, used in about 56% of teen courts nation wide; Youth Judge Model, used in the school system, (youth volunteers serve in all the roles, no judges present); Grand Jury Youth Model, a youth panel operates without a judge, but there are four lawyers that hold the inquisition and do all the questioning, and the Peer Jury Model. Mr. Graham indicated that the types of cases dealt with at the Teen Courts are determined by the Maricopa County Attorney's Office, which may include minor traffic offenses

Mr. Graham stated that Teen Court is an appealing program because; 1) it is a preventative method that deals with first and second time offenders, 2) it is an educational program, 3) it addresses the youth with their problems, and 4) it holds juveniles accountable for their actions.

Mr. Graham said that one of the common elements in Teen Court is the diversion aspect of the program; all teens must plead guilty before going to Teen Court. Some states have laws that allow teens to adjudicate; the State of Arizona does not allow it. The State of Arizona also has a law that determines what types of cases can go to Teen Court, and the Arizona Teen Courts only deal with first and second time offenders. Teen Court is open to the public and all kinds of volunteer youth and organizations get involved.

Mr. Graham continued by highlighting the types of offenses; the primary offense was shoplifting, followed by traffic violations, alcohol, tobacco, vandalism and other minor offenses. Mr. Graham noted that truancy is dealt with separately from the other cases because it is a different type of offence and needs many more resources. He followed with a brief discussion on the common types of sentencing "sanctions" which included; community services, counseling, or serving on a Teen Court jury.

Mr. Graham concluded with some final thoughts of why the Teen Court program has been successful. He said that research was conducted by the Urban Institute and it has found the use of cognitive behavior intervention, cognitive restructuring and cognitive skills school thinking methodologies have made the program a success. Mr. Graham proceeded to show a short video of the Teen Court in operation.

Mr. Graham referred the Supervisors to the Teen Court schedule and invited the Supervisors to attend a Teen Court session.

Supervisor Brock thanked the judges and staff for the outstanding presentation and noted that without the staff this program could not be possible. Supervisor Brock reiterated the fact that a great number of juveniles that go through the program do not repeat an offense more than once. He stated that teens sometimes do not realize or consider the consequences of their actions which could affect their future. Supervisor Brock said that he is thrilled to see the success and support of organizations towards this program.

In response to a question from Supervisor Stapley, Mr. Graham responded that Nevada and Alaska are the only two states, he is aware of, that have adjudication powers. He said "it has to do with laws by their legislatures that allow diversion without the person having to plead guilty."

Discussion ensued as to the means for implementing an adjudication process into Arizona Teen Courts that would be effective for minor cases. Mr. Graham asserted that efforts have been made to form a State Teen Court Association and with that association in place it would be more feasible to bring such a change to the Arizona Teen Courts.

MARICOPA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MINUTE BOOK

INFORMAL SESSION

August 22, 2005

Supervisor Wilcox agreed that the Teen Court program is a great program for the youths and complemented the staff on the success of the program.

Supervisor Kunasek raised a question in regards to restitution. Charlise Cordova, Teen Court Coordinator, stepped forward and asserted that restitution is dealt with within the school Teen Courts and those juveniles do have "restitution order" as Teen Court consequences.

Judge Orr, Teen Court Judge, took the opportunity to thank Supervisor Brock. Judge Orr said "we sometimes underestimate kids on a daily basis." He gave examples of cases that lead youths to Teen Court and how professional the volunteer teens doing the prosecution handled these sensitive issues. Judge Orr added that teen volunteers have had the opportunity to travel to Washington D.C. to witness cases in the U.S. Supreme Court and have the opportunity to participate in other events. He said Teen Court is a program that helps "keep honest kids honest."

Supervisor Wilson spoke on behalf of the Supervisors and said they are in favor and support Teen Court program.

2005 TAX RATE AMENDMENT

Motion was made by Supervisor Stapley, seconded by Supervisor Wilcox, and unanimously carried (5-0) to:

- Correct the action taken on August 15, 2005, by the Board of Supervisors in Item No. 1 "Fix and Determine Tax Rate", section two regarding the calculation of the levy and the setting of the resulting tax rate for the Tartesso West Community Facilities District on Schedule F, Page 9. The request was originally listed as:

District #	District	Levy Purpose	2005 Property Tax Levy	2005 Assessed Value/ Acreage	2005 Tax Rate
28870	Tartesso West CFD	Operation	1,078	359,453	0.3000

Based on a corrected resolution from the Tartesso West CFD Board of Directors, the corrected item should read:

District #	District	Levy Purpose	2005 Property Tax Levy	2005 Assessed Value/ Acreage	2005 Tax Rate
28870	Tartesso West CFD	<u>Operation and Debt Service</u>	<u>11,862</u>	359,453	<u>3.3000</u>

(Items added or changed are underlined)

- Direct the Treasurer to make corresponding changes in the affected tax bills. (4906004801) (ADM1815)

EXECUTIVE SESSION CALLED

Motion was made by Supervisor Stapley, seconded by Supervisor Brock, and unanimously carried (5-0) to recess and reconvene in Executive Session to consider items listed on the Executive Agenda dated August 22, 2005, pursuant to listed statutory authority, as follows.

LEGAL ADVICE; PENDING OR CONTEMPLATED LITIGATION -- ARS §38-431.03(A)(3) AND (A)(4)

Compromise Cases – Barbara Caldwell, Outside Counsel

Alvidrez, Isiah	Molina, Alma
Alvidrez, Sariah	Molina, Dominga
Boen, Monty	Piro, Valerie
Evans, Michael	Rusing, Terry
Godfrey, Alora	Theirbach, Amy
Gonzalez, Daniel	Williams, April
Guerrero, Herlinda	Williams, Tionna
Liss, Roberta	Wright, Russell

Write-Off Cases – Barbara Caldwell, Outside Counsel

Morales, David

PENDING OR CONTEMPLATED LITIGATION -- ARS §38-431.03(A)(4)

Maricopa County v. Kevin Troendle

Joy Rich, Director of Planning and Development
Katie McCormick, Deputy County Attorney
Terry Eckhardt, Deputy County Attorney

LEGAL ADVICE; CONTRACTS SUBJECT TO NEGOTIATIONS AND POTENTIAL LITIGATION -- ARS §38- 431.03(A)(3) AND 38-431.03(A)(4)

Baxter Claim

Steve Ellis, MIHS Director, Materials Management
Chris Keller, Deputy County Counsel
Wes Baysinger, Director, Maricopa County Materials Management

SETTLEMENT DISCUSSIONS CONDUCTED IN ORDER TO AVOID OR RESOLVE LITIGATION -- ARS §38-431.03(A)(4)

Della Hagler v. Maricopa County, et al., No. CV2004-006833

Dennis Carpenter, Deputy County Attorney
Peter Crowley, Maricopa County Risk Manager
Patrick Spencer, Claims Manager

PURCHASE, SALE OR LEASE OF REAL PROPERTY-- ARS §38-431.03(A)(7)

38.55 Acres in the City of Peoria

Tom Manos, Chief Financial Officer
Dennis Lindsey, Manager, Real Estate Services
William Riske, Deputy County Attorney

MARICOPA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MINUTE BOOK

INFORMAL SESSION
August 22, 2005

MEETING ADJOURNED

After discussion on the above items and there being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned.

ATTEST:

Max W. Wilson, Chairman of the Board

Lori Pacini, Deputy Clerk of the Board